


5-20-2015

Strengthening Biblical Historicity vis-a`-vis Minimalism, 1992–2008 and Beyond. Part 2.3: Some Commonalities in Approaches to Writing Ancient Israel's History

Lawrence J. Mykytiuk
Purdue University, larrym@purdue.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/lib_fsdocs

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [History of Religions of Eastern Origins Commons](#), [Jewish Studies Commons](#), and the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mykytiuk, Lawrence J., "Strengthening Biblical Historicity vis-à-vis Minimalism, 1992-2008 and Beyond, Part 2.3: Some Commonalities in Approaches to Writing Ancient Israel's History" (2015). *Libraries Faculty and Staff Scholarship and Research*. Paper . <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10477845.2015.1035197>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

Author's Accepted Manuscript before corrections.
Journal of Religious & Theological Information, 14:30–48,
2015 Published with license by Taylor & Francis
ISSN: 1047-7845 print / 1528-6924 online
DOI: 10.1080/10477845.2015.1035197



1 **Strengthening Biblical Historicity vis-à-vis**
2 **Minimalism, 1992–2008 and Beyond. Part 2.3:**
3 **Some Commonalities in Approaches to Writing**
4 **Ancient Israel’s History**

5 LAWRENCE J. MYKYTIUK
6 *Purdue University Libraries HSSE, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA*

7 *This series of articles covers scholarly works in English which can,*
8 *at least potentially, be associated with a generally positive view of*
9 *biblical historicity regarding periods preceding the Israelites’ return*
10 *from exile. Part 2 covers works that treat the methodological issues*
11 *at the center of the maximalist–minimalist debate. Parts 2.1 and 2.2*
12 *selectively survey the works of 24 non-minimalist scholars during*
13 *two decades. In the absence of consensus, this article analyzes the*
14 *works in Parts 2.1 and 2.2, tracing elements of approach that are*
15 *held in common, at least among pluralities of non-minimalists (pos-*
16 *sible majorities are not noted). The first commonality of approach*
17 *is that history is provisional, not final. The second is that history*
18 *should become fully multidisciplinary. The third commonality is*
19 *that historians should receive all historical evidence on an equal*
20 *footing before examination and cross-examination. The fourth and*
21 *last is that historians should become increasingly sensitive to cul-*
22 *tural aspects and coding in ancient Near Eastern materials. Parts*
23 *3–5 will cover select works on evidences.*

24 **KEYWORDS** *biblical historicity, historical methodology, historical*
25 *reliability of the Bible, history of Israel, non-minimalists*

26 What does a man get for all the toil and anxious striving with which he
27 labors under the sun?—Ecclesiastes 2:22

© Lawrence J. Mykytiuk
Address correspondence to Lawrence J. Mykytiuk, Purdue University Libraries HSSE,
504 W. State Street, West Lafayette, IN 47907-2058. E-mail: larrym@purdue.edu

28 This article and the two longer articles that preceded it attempt to answer
29 the question: *What is the profit* to be gained from over two decades of intense
30 scholarly effort focused on method since 1992?¹

31 Specifically, the present article gathers points from Parts 2.1 and 2.2 that
32 have the support of pluralities of scholars and presents them in organized
33 fashion, with a few brief comments. The intent is to make possible an ana-
34 lytical grasp of much of these two previous, long articles in this series. The
35 hope is that it might facilitate reflection and aid in formulating methodol-
36 ogy to help achieve optimal writing of the history of ancient Israel and her
37 neighbors.

38 The two immediately preceding articles in this series, Mykytiuk *Strengthen-*
39 *ing Part 2.1* and *Strengthening Part 2.2*, comprise a selective survey of the
40 approaches of 24 scholars since 1992. In the absence of a consensus among
41 historians of ancient Israel and her neighbors, this article seeks commonali-
42 ties among 24 approaches. Although this article was not part of the original
43 plan envisioned in Part 1 of this series, it falls into exactly the right place in
44 the orderly sequence.

45 Criteria used to select the 24 scholars are that they are (1) non-
46 minimalists for whom (2) there is a live possibility that much of the Hebrew
47 Bible may contain valid historical data and (3) they have written significantly
48 in a relevant area.

49 Immediately below, “Where treated in this series” is intended to be a
50 help, because the discussion following simply lists these scholars by their
51 last names. *It is much easier to find the points referred to via the endnotes or*
52 *by using the “Where treated” column than by using the bibliography.*

53 The 24 select scholars, whom one may whimsically call “the four and
54 twenty elders,”² are as follows.

55 Views of several other scholars are also included where there is com-
56 monality or if a salient point seems to deserve mention.

57 Inevitably, some important views held by worthy scholars, including
58 the select 24, are not included. Rather, this article tracks some *elements of*
59 *approach that are held in common*. The common elements are usually found
60 in the parameters within which the approaches operate. The shared aspect
61 promotes credibility and conciseness.

62 The main question is: What potential lessons in methodology are avail-
63 able for harvest, potential development, and use?

64 Regarding standards:⁷

65 1. History is provisional, not final. It must be rigorous, yet it has a place for
66 imagination.

67 • “All reconstructions are provisional” states Grabbe,⁸ encapsulating simi-
68 lar views from Hayes and Miller, Brettler, Becking, Frendo, et al.⁹ Moore
69 stresses that writing history with the awareness that it is provisional does

Scholar	Where treated in this series
Richard E. Averbeck	Part 2.2, 130–132
James Barr	Part 2.1, 120–121
Hans M. Barstad	Part 2.1, 123–125
Craig G. Bartholomew	Part 2.2, 120–121
Bob Becking	Part 2.1, 121–122
David M. Carr ³	Part 2.3, Appendix
Anthony J. Frendo	Part 2.2, 142–143 n. 2 ⁴
Lester L. Grabbe	Part 2.1, 118–120
Baruch Halpern	Part 2.2, 116–117
John H. Hayes	Part 2.1, 116
Ronald S. Hendel	Part 2.1, 125–126
James K. Hoffmeier	Part 2.2, 139–141
Kenneth A. Kitchen	Part 2.2, 122–123
Jens Bruun Kofoed	Part 2.2, 123–130
V. Philips Long	Part 2.2, 137–139
Amihai Mazar	Part 2.1, 122–123, and Part 2.2, 143–144 n. 2 ⁵
J. Maxwell Miller	Part 2.1, 116
Robert D. Miller II	Part 2.2, 117–118
Megan Bishop Moore	Part 2.1, 116–118
Nadav Na'aman	Part 2.2 n. 2 ⁶
Iain W. Provan	Part 2.2, 132–137
Mark S. Smith	Part 2.1, 126–128
Andrew G. Vaughn	Part 2.2, 115–116
H. G. M. Williamson	Part 2.2, 118–119

70 not imply any reduction of scholarly rigor.¹⁰ The “story” must be historically
 71 grounded (Becking; Klein),¹¹ yet the art of history has a place for imag-
 72 ination (Becking; Vaughn).¹² Historical reconstruction is partly subjective
 73 (Becking; Frendo),¹³ so the goal of dialogue is “intersubjective knowledge
 74 of the past,” as Becking phrases it.¹⁴

75 “Provisional” includes letting unknowns be unknowns, without com-
 76 mitting the reductive error, since absence of evidence is not evidence of
 77 absence. In the lacunae created by unknowns, there is room for imaginative
 78 analogies and perhaps partly grounded scenarios. For example, presumably
 79 in the gap between event and biblical text, A. Mazar and H. G. M. Williamson
 80 posited that temple and palace archives provided source material for the writ-
 81 ing of the history of Israel (Mazar suggested the late monarchic period and
 82 Williamson the time of the United Monarchy).¹⁵ Since both the existence
 83 of such libraries and/or archives and their use in writing some of Israel’s
 84 history of Israel are plausible hypotheses, one cannot reasonably disallow
 85 such hypotheses on the grounds that extrabiblical evidence is lacking.

86 Regarding evidence and archaeology:¹⁶

87 1. History should become fully multidisciplinary.

88 Favoring new multidisciplinary breadth in writing history:

- 89 • Scholars should attempt a far more comprehensive, demanding, multidisci-
90 plinary way of studying ancient Israel's history than previously attempted,
91 as urged by Hess, Kitchen, and Moore (earlier, Thompson *Early History*
92 had included climate as a factor).¹⁷

93 **Comment:** An integrated team approach by many coauthors is far more
94 common in the sciences than in the humanities, where the sole-author pub-
95 lication reigns supreme. The closest we humanists usually come is the edited
96 volume of collected, sole-author essays. Can such an academic subculture
97 come to accommodate a truly integrated, team approach?

98 Conceivably, a more difficult pitfall in multidisciplinary work is the va-
99 riety of assumptions, methods, and kinds of data involved. Integrated stud-
100 ies should show awareness of real and potential interdisciplinary clashes,
101 whether obvious or subtle, and whether these are harmful or might be used
102 to gain certain advantages.

- 103 • A multidisciplinary approach that includes archaeology, epigraphy, sociol-
104 ogy, anthropology, etc. implies that the Bible has a referential dimension.
105 This dimension is essential to any biblical claim to historical truth. Part of
106 the contribution of Bartholomew, as well as Kofoed, Andrew P. Norman,
107 and Hoffmeier, is *explicit* treatment of the referential dimension, whereas
108 many others assume it implicitly.¹⁸
- 109 • That the referential dimension necessarily involves present-day theological
110 issues in interpretation is an understanding (possibly a conviction) held
111 by Vaughn, Bartholomew, Meir Sternberg, Becking, et al.¹⁹ As Vaughn
112 expressed it, to “jettison history and archaeology” runs “the risk of reducing
113 God to a psychological or rhetorical concept.”²⁰
- 114 • The referential dimension of the Bible, in turn, opens the question of
115 whether meaning is intrinsic in events or in historians' employment. Ko-
116 foed and Norman insist, contra Hayden White, that meaning is intrinsic in
117 events.²¹ Long implies the referential dimension, a constraining factor, by
118 stating that “the task of the historian is to recognize the past's contours
119 and meaningfully connected features and to represent them in a verbal
120 medium. . . . the historian's creativity is constrained by the actualities of the
121 subject. . . .”²² R. D. Miller found that White and others “draw attention to a
122 real past that *constrains* our reconstructions” and that “the aim of research
123 is to gain knowledge that ‘constrains,’” while he seeks to avoid, along with

124 “Rankean empiricism,” “naïve Biblicism,” etc., “a postmodernist scepticism
125 about the approachability to any external reality.”²³

126 1. Historians should examine and cross-examine *all* historical evidence on
127 an equal footing.

128 • Regarding examination and cross-examination, it is methodologically valid
129 to treat biblical data according to the jurisprudence analogy or forensic
130 model (R. D. Miller, Long, Grabbe, Becking).²⁴ Equal footing includes
131 such things as both *la longue durée* and relatively brief catalysts that seem
132 to have precipitated change (see below), as well as both archaeological
133 and biblical data. Note also the relevance of Na’aman’s and Finkelstein’s
134 disagreement on the question of whether archaeology should be the “high
135 court” in biblical historical research.²⁵ If all evidence is received on an
136 equal footing, and evidence is evaluated on a case-to-case basis, *is* there
137 one area of study that should be *the* high court?

138 Favoring inclusion of *la longue durée*, yet in a balanced way that in-
139 cludes catalysts:

140 • *La longue durée*, according to Grabbe, must not be ignored.²⁶ Williamson
141 found that archaeology is best suited for revealing information about *la*
142 *longue durée* but that archaeology sometimes does not indicate catalysts
143 (a set of circumstances, a group, or a specific individual) that precipitate
144 change.²⁷ Kofoed also sought balance between *la longue durée* and cata-
145 lysts; R. D. Miller noted rejection of the loss of importance of the individual
146 in history via Braudel’s three-tier model, even from quarters usually asso-
147 ciated with collectivism; and Provan, Long, and Longman protested similar
148 minimalist misuse of that model.²⁸

Q1

149 Favoring the limitation to use historical evidence to answer historical
150 questions rather than allow present-day theological issues affect outcomes:

151 • Historical questions are to be settled on historical grounds, using histor-
152 ical methods, without attempting to employ current theological doctrines
153 to which the researcher subscribes or a scholar’s religious convictions to
154 make a historical argument (Grabbe; Kitchen).²⁹ Moore sought objectivity
155 as a regulative ideal, eschewing both faith-based epistemology and episte-
156 mology based on scepticism.³⁰ Likewise, for Barr and Barstad, the absence
157 of extrabiblical information to confirm a biblical assertion or reference is
158 not an adequate reason to doubt it, any more than that one should doubt
159 the countless *non*-biblical documents that lack support in other ancient
160 documents.³¹ R. D. Miller II warned against rejecting the narrative history
161 of the Hebrew Bible as a potential starting-point.³² For each episode or

162 event, all data are to be judged on a case-by-case basis, with no default po-
 163 sition favoring or rejecting Scripture (Grabbe; Mazar; Smith; Williamson³³).

164 **Comment:** With no default position, thus no a priori acceptance, rejec-
 165 tion, favoring, or suspicion of biblical texts, those who follow this approach
 166 espouse methodological avoidance of both maximalism and minimalism.
 167 (This point involves the simple recognition that not all non-minimalists are
 168 maximalists.)

169 It might be seen as a potential difficulty that ancient theology is an
 170 integral part of the historical evidence that must be analyzed. The following
 171 observation serves as an example: “The ‘theology’ of the composition was
 172 simply treated as an essential part of their true ‘history’ (in the sense of
 173 historically accurate ‘history writing’)” (Averbeck).³⁴

174 It would seem helpful, if perhaps not a complete solution, to distinguish
 175 between ancient and modern theology. Ancient theology comes as part and
 176 parcel of the culture of ancient sources and must be respected as such
 177 (see point 4 below on ancient Near Eastern culture). Ancient theological
 178 views affected the behavior of people in many areas of life, not least by
 179 divinely sanctioned imperatives and prohibitions. If, for example, a deity
 180 was understood to have authorized the rule of a particular monarch, then
 181 that monarch was normally in a much stronger position than otherwise.
 182 Present-day theology, on the other hand, can affect the present-day scholar’s
 183 view of the text and might interfere with objectivity in approach.

184 Favoring, in addition to consideration of archaeological evidence, con-
 185 sideration of biblical evidence—but only that which is historical in nature,
 186 and plainly so, not that which is based on current theology:

187 1. One must be very careful about placing *methodological* limits on what
 188 may be admitted as evidence to be considered. Instead of excluding bib-
 189 lical data (e.g., Banks *Writing the History*), biblical materials should be
 190 included for consideration (Athas³⁵ and all 24 authors listed above who
 191 are treated in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* and *Strengthening Part*
 192 *2.2*), though one holds that a case must still make a case for *using* these
 193 data (Grabbe).³⁶ A biblical text must neither be accepted nor rejected be-
 194 cause it is part of a religious and theological collection (Grabbe; Barr³⁷),
 195 nor because it has a literary aspect (Barr; Kofoed; Millard³⁸).

196 **Comment:** In effect, current theological doctrines (e.g., John Goldingay
 197 “acknowledges the theological imperative toward a maximalist position”³⁹)
 198 may be permitted to hold open for consideration some historical options
 199 that might otherwise have been excluded a priori by views that may be too
 200 narrow. Nevertheless, such held-open options are to be explored using his-
 201 torical methods and evidences, which are essentially separate from modern
 202 theological and religious beliefs (Grabbe; Kitchen⁴⁰).

203 Favoring, specifically, considering biblical data on an equal footing with
204 other historical evidence:

205 1. Historical data in the Bible are to be received on an equal footing with
206 other historical evidence before being similarly subjected to examination
207 and cross-examination. Halpern argued effectively, for example, that data
208 in the book of Kings fit well with contemporaneous extrabiblical data and
209 should be used to write the history of the period;⁴¹ Barr, Barstad, Provan,
210 Long, and Frendo each made a case that the Bible's ideological aspect,
211 literary forms, and/or religious bias do not lessen its historical value and
212 that it is not to be treated with greater scepticism than any other source of
213 data.⁴² Therefore, it should not be subjected to a methodology that requires
214 it to validate itself according to an external standard, such as archaeological
215 conclusions, before it even receives a hearing (Provan,⁴³ representing a
216 view generally held by maximalists and some "neither-nors"). One may
217 say that the Bible is not to be treated as guilty until proven innocent.

218 1. Historians should become increasingly sensitive to cultural aspects and
219 coding in ancient Near Eastern materials.

220 • Hoffmeier and Ziony Zevit⁴⁴ (and indeed, Mircea Eliade⁴⁵) have a clear
221 philosophical preference for a phenomenological approach. The salient
222 message of Hoffmeier's six main points describing it⁴⁶ seems to be that
223 its great virtue is to allow maximum freedom for cultural difference in
224 the context of history, without interference from methodology or from the
225 world view of the modern researcher.

226 Favoring oral and ritual tradition as transmitters of historical data:

227 • Kofoed leaned on Blenkinsopp regarding modern analogies⁴⁷ In working
228 with ancient Hebrew culture, Kofoed pointed out, historians should take
229 into account oral, ritual, and artifactual transmission of the "central thrust"
230 of cultural memory.⁴⁸

231 Favoring simultaneous oral and textual traditions:

232 • Kofoed also understood the Hebrew Bible to be partly based on oral
233 and textual traditions that potentially continued side by side for long time
234 periods. He relied on "a commonplace in contemporary Old Testament
235 research" to support "a prolonged oral transmission . . . in pre-exilic Is-
236 rael."⁴⁹ Going farther in that direction, Carr, whose work is treated in the
237 Appendix, offers empirical evidence for text-supported memory as an im-
238 portant factor in Israelite scribal practice, along with the apparent results:

Q2

Q3

Q4

239 diminished modern ability to trace the history of textual transmission and
240 to date texts linguistically.

241 Favoring the inclusion of historical origins of biblical texts in literary
242 treatments:

- Q5 243 • Long and Kofoed argued against purely literary treatments of historical
244 texts, finding that purely literary views ignore crucial questions about the
245 original understanding of oral and/or written traditions and, as a result,
246 misread them. “[T]o argue that the historical information present in . . .
247 a literary innovation must be considered a *literary invention* is a non
248 sequitur.”⁵⁰

249 History vis-à-vis cultural memory: replacement or coexistence?

- 250 • Barstad foresaw the collapse of modernism in scholarship, including the
251 *Annales’* “total history” and minimalism, to be followed by “a drastically
252 less scientific form of history in the realm of culture.”⁵¹ Other scholars who
253 work in the area of cultural memory, however, do not forecast a cata-
254 climytic shift but imply coexistence, with perhaps more treatments of the
255 biblical text as cultural memory. Hendel saw cultural memory as a branch
256 of history, namely, “reception theory applied to history,” capable of reach-
257 ing historical conclusions about traditions.⁵² M. S. Smith finds that “biblical
258 presentations of the past shape the past to conform to [then] present con-
259 cerns.”⁵³ This understanding, which seems to approach the biblical text as
260 cultural memory in then-present application, evidently agrees with Hen-
261 del and also with Barstad’s view that the biblical prophets’ focus was on
262 preaching, not so much on what actually happened.⁵⁴

263 Favoring the use of ancient historiographic conventions to understand
264 history:

- 265 • In accord with Bartholomew’s favorable remarks on attempting to discern
266 ancient conventions in historiographic patterns in early writings of other
267 ancient Near Eastern cultures,⁵⁵ a short essay by Averbeck illustrated the
268 use of Sumerian formal conventions to narrate the building of a temple. He
269 observed, “The ancients . . . did not see this as ‘fiction.’”⁵⁶ Barstad made a
270 similar observation about culturally determined, stereotypical literary pat-
271 terns. Still, he feels that they can keep us from recovering “what really
272 happened.”⁵⁷ Valuable primary-source resources on ancient Near Eastern
273 cultures include Sparks’s *Ancient Texts*.

274

CONCLUSION

275 Each of the above four commonalities of approach among some non-
 276 minimalists is a call for change. Because history is provisional, not final,
 277 it has a built-in restlessness that ever seeks more data, better understanding,
 278 and better, more complete, syntheses. The means by which these are gen-
 279 erated may include new discoveries, refusing to harmonize sharp disagree-
 280 ments and tensions, and gathering data more broadly, perhaps in meticulous
 281 detail, as exemplified in Carr (*Formation*). To be satisfied with traditional
 282 views, regardless of intellectual, academic, religious, or theological persua-
 283 sion, is to diminish historical research and to move in the direction of the
 284 death of history.

285 Because history should become fully multidisciplinary, scholars of the
 286 humanities should both expand their research horizons to realize the need
 287 for other disciplines in the effort and, as may be needed, should learn to
 288 work as contributing members of research teams.

289 Because historians should receive all historical evidence on an equal
 290 footing before examination and cross-examination, maximalist scholars
 291 should expect that even after biblical evidence is no longer subjected to
 292 verification before being heard, in the analyses of “neither–nor” scholars (nei-
 293 ther maximalist nor minimalist), it will often experience “rough-and-tumble”
 294 cross-examination along with other kinds of evidence, to which they may
 295 wish to respond.⁵⁸

296 Because historians should become increasingly sensitive to cultural as-
 297 pects and coding in ancient Near Eastern materials, expertise in cultural
 298 anthropology and cross-cultural studies should be prized and increasingly
 299 applied to the interpretation of artifacts, and ancient Near Eastern texts,
 300 whether epigraphic or biblical.

301

ADDENDA TO PART 2.2

302 In Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (121–122), the following should be added
 303 in chronological order to the list of “Edited Volumes of Essays That Are
 304 Maximalist to Largely ‘Positive’ toward the Bible”:

305 Daniel I. Block, ed., *Israel: Ancient Kingdom or Late Invention?* (2008); Bill
 306 T. Arnold and Richard S. Hess, eds., *Ancient Israel’s History: An Introduction
 307 to Issues and Sources* (2014).

308 Accordingly, the following bibliographic entries are to be inserted on pp.
 309 148 and 149, respectively, of Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2*:

310 Arnold, Bill T., and Richard S. Hess, Eds. *Ancient Israel’s History: An Intro-
 311 duction to Issues and Sources*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2014.

312 Block, Daniel I. *Israel: Ancient Kingdom or Late Invention?* Nashville, TN:
 313 B&H Academic, 2008.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

315 I dedicate this essay to John Gregory Turner, MTS, independent scholar,
 316 Chicago, Illinois, with well-founded respect for his scholarship and deep
 317 appreciation for his friendship. I also gratefully acknowledge Purdue Uni-
 318 versity's Dean of Libraries, James L. Mullins, granting me six months' sabbat-
 319 ical leave during 2009 to conduct research for the bibliographic essay that
 320 this series of articles comprises. I appreciate having had the opportunity to
 321 present an earlier, short version of this material in San Diego at the 2014
 322 Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in the Hebrew Bible,
 323 History, and Archaeology section co-chaired by Jeremy Smoak and Matthew
 324 Suriano on November 23, 2014. Finally, and with sincere gratitude, I wish
 325 to thank the *JRTI* scholars who reviewed this article. As the author, I alone
 326 bear the responsibility for all of its flaws and shortcomings.

NOTES

- 328 1. The year 1992 was chosen, because during that year, two books brought major changes to
 329 biblical studies and to the study of ancient Israel's history: Thompson's *Early History* and Davies's *In*
 330 *Search*.
 331 2. Rev 4:4, 10; 5:8; 11:16; and 19:4.
 332 3. Here I take the liberty of listing an important non-minimalist not covered in Parts 2.2 and 2.3:
 333 David M. Carr. Appended to this article is a summary of Carr's approach in his book, *The Formation of the*
 334 *Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (2011). Carr is substituted for Israel Finkelstein, because the limited
 335 coverage of only two of Finkelstein's minor publications in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (143–144 n.
 336 2) does not add to the list of commonalities, whereas coverage of Carr's book does.
 337 4. Treatment in an endnote merely signifies that the select works treated were published after
 338 2008, hence covered in the "beyond" of the article title (except for A. Mazar).
 339 5. Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (143–144 n. 2), paragraph in parentheses.
 340 6. Treatment in an endnote merely signifies that the works treated, published after 2008, were
 341 covered in the "beyond" of the article title (except for A. Mazar).
 342 7. See Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (109–110).
 343 8. Grabbe (*Ancient Israel* 26), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (119).
 344 9. Hayes and Miller (82); Brettler (16); Becking (68), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1*
 345 (109, 121, respectively). Frendo (99–100), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (142 n. 2).
 346 10. Moore (*Philosophy* 183), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (118).
 347 11. Becking (68–69) and Ralph W. Klein's review of *1–2 Kings* by Gina Hens-Piazza (2), both
 348 quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening 2.1* (121–122, 132 n. 29, respectively).
 349 12. Becking (68), described in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (121); Vaughn (414), quoted in
 350 Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (115–116).
 351 13. Becking (68), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (121), appropriating Newman
 352 (175–208 *passim*), Frendo (100), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2*.
 353 14. Becking (68), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (121).
 354 15. These two hypotheses relate to the gap between event and writing/editing favoring interme-
 355 diate sources of historical data mentioned in Mykytiuk *Strengthening 2.1* (110–111). Mazar reasonably
 356 asserted that at least a kernel of important ancient evidence may exist in a given biblical text, despite a
 357 lengthy chronological gap between the time to which the text purports to refer and the time of writing
 358 and/or editing. "Late monarchic authors and redactors used early materials, such as temple and palace
 359 libraries and archives" (A. Mazar *Spade and the Text* 144, quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening 2.1* 123).
 360 Williamson made a case for archival sources during the united monarchy and for that period as the most
 361 appropriate time for the growth of a strictly political history of Israel. Israel's national consciousness

- 362 looked back from the standpoint of the monarchy (Williamson 148–149, described in Mykytiuk *Strengthening*
 363 *Part 2.2* 119). On the likelihood that such archives or libraries existed in the Hebrew kingdoms and
 364 on their possible role in relation to the Hebrew Bible, cf., du Toit; Löwisch, review of du Toit *Textual*
 365 *Memory*.
- 366 16. See Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (110, 112–115).
- 367 17. Hess (14–15), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (106–107). Kitchen (*Hebrew Bible*
 368 150) and Moore (*Writing* 35); Moore (*Beyond* 5–6, 7) are both quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part*
 369 *2.1* (130 n. 12). Thompson (*Early History* 215–221).
- 370 18. Bartholomew (404), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (120); Kofoed (200), quoting
 371 Hirsch (70), in turn quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (129). Norman (119–135), described and
 372 quoted in Kofoed (13–15); Hoffmeier (22, point 3), described or quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part*
 373 *2.2* (124, 139, respectively).
- 374 19. Killebrew and Vaughn (10); Vaughn (412–416), described in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2*
 375 (115); Bartholomew (404), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (120); Sternberg (320), described
 376 in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (120–121). By apparently espousing Collingwood's view of realism,
 377 Becking implies a similar point of view in his *Inscribed Seals* (67), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part*
 378 *2.1* (121).
- 379 20. Vaughn (413, 414), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (115).
- 380 21. Kofoed (13–15) and Norman (130–131), both described in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2*
 381 (124). White (20).
- 382 22. Long (*Narrative and History* 84), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (137).
- 383 23. R. D. Miller (157, 160), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (117, 118, respectively).
- 384 24. R. D. Miller (158), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (118); Long (*Israel's Past*
 385 581–582), cited by Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (118); Grabbe (*Are Historians* 193); Becking clearly
 386 implied cross-examination in discussions among scholars in his *Inscribed Seals* (68), quoted in Mykytiuk
 387 *Strengthening Part 2.2* (121–122).
- 388 25. Briefly discussed in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (143–144 n. 2).
- 389 26. Grabbe (*Ancient Israel* 35), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (119, point 3).
- 390 27. Williamson (144, 146–148), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (118–119).
- 391 28. Kofoed (4, 25–27), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (123–124); R. D. Miller (154),
 392 mentions “British Marxists such as E. P. Thompson . . . rejecting . . . the submergence of the individual in
 393 its [Annales'] structuralism” (referring to E. P. Thompson *Making* 9); Provan, Long, and Longman (77–
 394 79).
- 395 29. Grabbe (*Ancient Israel* 36), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (119, point 6); Kitchen
 396 (*On the Reliability* 3) is quoted in Bartholomew (404), which in turn is quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening*
 397 *Part 2.2* (120).
- 398 30. Moore (*Philosophy* 160–161), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (117).
- 399 31. Barr (79), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (120–121); similar but only implicit
 400 regarding extrabiblical verification is Barstad (*Bibliophobia*, in its version as chapter 3 of *History and the*
 401 *Hebrew Bible*, 39, 45), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (124–125).
- 402 32. R. D. Miller (159–160), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (118).
- 403 33. Grabbe (*Are Historians* 35; *The Exile* 97; *Ancient Israel* 36), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening*
 404 *Part 2.1* (118, 118–119, 119; the second point 4 plus point 6, respectively). A. Mazar (*The Spade and*
 405 *the Text*, a chapter in Williamson *Understanding*, 144) and M. S. Smith (*Memoirs of God* 13), both
 406 quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (123, 127, respectively). Williamson (145), quoted in Mykytiuk
 407 *Strengthening Part 2.2* (118), finds that the evidence will not support any “blanket” view, whether
 408 dismissal or acceptance “at face value” but still accepts that the Bible has “an historical bedrock.”
- 409 34. Averbek (109).
- 410 35. Athas (14), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (106).
- 411 36. Grabbe (*Are Historians* 35), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (118, point 3).
- 412 37. Grabbe (*The Exile* 97) and Barr (82), both of which are quoted or described in Mykytiuk
 413 *Strengthening Part 2.1* (118–119, point 3, and 120, respectively).
- 414 38. Barr (83–84), described in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (120). Kofoed (29) and Millard
 415 (37–64), described in Kofoed (29, 29 n. 82), both of which are quoted in or cited by Mykytiuk *Strengthening*
 416 *Part 2.2* (125, 146 n. 24, respectively).
- 417 39. Goldingay (405), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (120).

- 418 40. Grabbe (*Ancient Israel* 36), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (119, point 6). Kitchen
419 (*On the Reliability* 3), quoted in Bartholomew (405), in turn quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2*
420 (120).
- 421 41. Halpern (546–565), described in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (117).
- 422 42. Barr (82, 83–84) and Barstad (*History and the Hebrew Bible*, in its version as chapter 1
423 in *History and the Hebrew Bible*, 20, 21, 23), both of which are quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening*
424 *Part 2.1* (120, 124, respectively). Provan (*Ideologies* 588, 605), Long (*Biblical History* 75, 76, 81), and
425 Frendo (102), all three quoted or described in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (132, 137, 142 n. 2,
426 respectively).
- Q9 427 43. Provan (*Ideologies* 601–602; *In the Stable* 301) and *Biblical History* (54, 55, 56, 73, 74) are all
428 three quoted or described in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (132, 134, 135, respectively).
- 429 44. Zevit (23 n. 19, 24–27).
- 430 45. For example, “Our sole aim has been a summary phenomenological analysis of these periodic
431 purification rites. . .” (*Eliade Myth* 73); see also his *Phenomenology*.
- 432 46. Hoffmeier (32–33), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (141).
- 433 47. Blenkinsopp (77–78), quoted in Kofoed (78), which in turn is quoted without any direct
434 quotation from Blenkinsopp in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (127).
- 435 48. Kofoed (77, 88), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (126, 128, respectively).
- 436 49. See note 46.
- 437 50. Kofoed (29), emphasis his, quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (125).
- 438 51. Barstad (*History and the Hebrew Bible*, in its version as chapter 1 in his *History and the Hebrew*
439 *Bible*, 12), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (124).
- 440 52. Hendel (58), quoting Assmann (8–9), in turn quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1*
441 (126).
- 442 53. M. S. Smith (*Early History of God* xxviii), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (127).
- 443 54. Barstad *Issues in the Narrative Truth Debate*, in its version as chapter 2 in his *History and the*
444 *Hebrew Bible*, 37), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (124).
- 445 55. Barstad (*History and the Hebrew Bible*, in its version as chapter 1 in his *History and the Hebrew*
446 *Bible*, 20), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (124).
- 447 56. Averbeck (109), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (131).
- 448 57. Barstad (*History and the Hebrew Bible*, in its version as chapter 1 in his *History and the Hebrew*
449 *Bible*, 20), quoted in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.1* (124).
- 450 58. For example Grabbe (*Are Historians*), to which Long responded in his *How Reliable*, both
451 treated in Mykytiuk *Strengthening Part 2.2* (137–138).
- 452 59. Portions of this summary rely on Erisman’s review of Carr (*Formation* 1–2). All errors and
453 shortcomings, however, are the present author’s responsibility.
- 454 60. For example, as George Foote Moore pointed out, P passages are clearly discernable in the Pen-
455 tateuch, as are texts from the Gospel of John in the *Diatessaron* (Carr *Formation* 109). “Nevertheless, . . .
456 a return to the clarity and simplicity of the documentary hypothesis is no longer possible,” because
457 the portion of it “relating to the identification of cross-Pentateuchal ‘J’ and ‘E’ sources (even aside from
458 questions of dating them) has proven multiply flawed” (110).
- 459 61. Rollston (44).
- 460 62. Cf., Rollston (19–46, 91–126).
- 461 63. Rather than attempting to gather knowledge from many peoples, the kingdom’s scribal pro-
462 duction would have focused on its own heritage; cf., du Toit (138–155, especially 154–155) regarding the
463 model of relatively small, truly *national* libraries at Sippar and Ebla, rather than the model of “universal”
464 libraries of Ashurbanipal and at Alexandria.

WORKS CITED

- 466 Assmann, Jan. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*.
Q10 467 Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1997. Print.
- 468 Athas, George. ‘Minimalism’: *The Copenhagen School of Thought in Biblical Studies: Edited Transcript of Lecture, 3rd ed., University of Sydney, 29 Apr. 1999*. John
469 Mark Ministries. 5 Jan. 2003. Web. 19 Mar. 2015.

- 471 Averbeck Richard E. "Sumer, the Bible, and Comparative Method: Historiography
472 and Temple Building." *Mesopotamia and the Bible: Comparative Explorations*.
473 Ed. Mark W. Chavalas and K. Lawson Younger, Jr. Sheffield, England: Sheffield
474 Academic, 2002. 88–125. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supp. Ser.*
475 341.
- 476 Banks, Diane Nunn. *Writing the History of Israel*. Diss. Vanderbilt U,
477 2004. New York: Clark, 2006. *Lib. of Heb. Bible/Old Testament Studies*
478 438.
- 479 Barr, James. *History and Ideology in the Old Testament: Biblical Studies at the End of*
480 *a Millennium: The Hensley Henson Lectures for 1997 Delivered to the University*
481 *of Oxford*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000.
- 482 Barstad, Hans M. "Bibliophobia in Recent Ancient Israelite Historiography." 1998.
483 *History and the Hebrew Bible: Studies in Ancient Israelite and Ancient Near*
484 *Eastern Historiography*. Ed. Hans M. Barstad. Tübingen: Mohr, 2008. 39–45.
485 *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 61.
- 486 ———. "History and the Hebrew Bible." 1997. *Barstad History and the Hebrew Bible*.
487 1–24. = Grabbe *Can a History* 37–64. Q11
- 488 ———. *History and the Hebrew Bible: Studies in Ancient Israelite and Ancient Near*
489 *Eastern Historiography*. Tübingen: Mohr, 2008. *Forschungen zum Alten Testa-*
490 *ment* 61.
- 491 ———. "Issues in the Narrative Truth Debate." 2002. *History and the Hebrew Bible:*
492 *Studies in Ancient Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography*. Ed. Hans
493 M. Barstad. Tübingen: Mohr, 2008. 25–38. *Forschungen zum Alten Testament*
494 61.
- 495 Bartholomew, Craig G. "Hermeneutics." *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Histori-*
496 *cal Books*. Ed. Bill T. Arnold, and H. G. M. Williamson. Downers Grove, IL:
497 InterVarsity, 2005. 392–407.
- 498 Becking, Bob. "Inscribed Seals as Evidence for Biblical Israel? Jeremiah 40.7–41.15
499 *par exemple*." *Can a 'History of Israel' Be Written?* Ed. Lester L. Grabbe. Sheffield,
500 England: Sheffield Academic, 1997. 65–83. *Journal for the Study of the Old*
501 *Testament Supp. Ser.* 245. *European Seminar in Historical Methodology* 1. Q12
- 502 Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Memory, Tradition, and the Construction of the Past in Ancient
503 Israel." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 27 (1997): 76–82.
- 504 Brettler, Marc Zvi. "The Copenhagen School: The Historiographical Issues." *AJS Re-*
505 *view* 27 (2003): 1–21.
- 506 Carr, David M. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. New York:
507 Oxford UP, 2011.
- 508 ———. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. New
509 York: Oxford UP, 2005. Q13
- 510 Collingwood, R. G. *The Idea of History*. Oxford, England: Oxford UP, 1946.
- 511 Davies, Philip R. *In Search of 'Ancient Israel.'* 1992. 2nd ed. Sheffield, England:
512 Sheffield Academic, 1995. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supp. Ser.*
513 148. Q14
- 514 Eliade, Mircea. *Phenomenology and New Directions*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers,
515 1978.
- 516 ———. *The Myth of the Eternal Return: Cosmos and History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton
517 UP, 2005, 1954.

- 518 Erisman, Angela Roskop. Review of David McLain Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew*
519 *Bible*. H-Judaic, H-Net Reviews, June 2012. Web. 19 Mar. 2015.
- 520 Finkelstein, Israel. "Archaeology as a High Court in Ancient Israelite History: A Reply
521 to Nadav Na'aman." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 10 (2010): article 19. Web. 19
522 Mar. 2015.
- 523 Finkelstein, Israel, Amihai Mazar, and Brian B. Schmidt. *The Quest for the Historical*
524 *Israel: Debating Archaeology and the History of Early Israel*. Atlanta, GA: Society
525 of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- Q15** 526 Frendo, Anthony J. *Pre-Exilic Israel, the Hebrew Bible, and Archaeology: Integrating*
527 *Text and Artefact*. New York: Clark, 2011. Lib. of Heb. Bible/Old Testament
528 Studies 549.
- 529 Goldingay, John. *Models for Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, Carlisle, Eng-
530 land: Paternoster, 1994.
- 531 Grabbe, Lester L. *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* New
532 York: Clark, 2007.
- 533 ———. "Are Historians of Ancient Palestine Fellow Creatures—or Different Animals?"
534 *Can a 'History of Israel' Be Written?* Ed. Lester L. Grabbe. Sheffield, England:
535 Sheffield Academic, 1997. 19–36. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
536 Supp. Ser. 245. European Seminar in Historical Methodology 1.
- 537 ———, ed. *Can a 'History of Israel' Be Written?* Sheffield, England: Sheffield Aca-
538 demic, 1997. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supp. Ser. 245. Euro-
539 pean Seminar in Historical Methodology 1.
- Q16** 540 ———. "The Exile' under the Theodolite: Historiography as Triangulation." *Leading*
541 *Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology*. Ed. Lester L. Grabbe.
542 Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 1998. 80–100. Journal for the Study of
543 the Old Testament Supp. Ser. 278. European Seminar in Historical Methodology
544 2.
- 545 Halpern, Baruch. "The State of Israelite History." *Reconsidering Israel and Judah:*
546 *Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. Ed. Gary N. Knoppers and J.
547 Gordon McConville. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000. 540–565. Sources for
548 Biblical and Theological Study 8.
- 549 Hayes, John H., and J. Maxwell Miller. *A History of Israel and Judah*. 1986. 2nd ed.
550 Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- 551 Hendel, Ronald S. *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the*
552 *Hebrew Bible*. New York: Oxford UP, 2005.
- 553 Hess, Richard S. "Recent Studies in Old Testament History: A Review Article," *Theme-*
554 *lios* 19 (1994): 9–15.
- 555 Hirsch, E.D. *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1967.
- 556 Hoffmeier, James K. *Ancient Israel in Sinai: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the*
557 *Wilderness Tradition*. New York: Oxford UP, 2005.
- 558 Killebrew, Ann E., and Andrew G. Vaughn, "Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology:
559 Dialogues and Discussions." *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Tem-*
560 *ple Period*. Ed. Andrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew. Atlanta: Society of
561 Biblical Literature, 2003. 1–10. SBL Symposium Series 18.
- Q17** 562 Kitchen, Kenneth A. "The Hebrew Bible and its Critics—A Verdict from the Ancient
563 Near East [summary of lecture]." *Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Society* 26 (2008):
564 149–150.

- 565 ———. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- 566 Klein, Ralph W. *Review of 1–2 Kings*, by Gina Hens-Piazza. *Review of Biblical Literature*.
- 567 atue. Dec. 2007. Web. 1 Dec. 2007.
- 568 Kofoed, Jens Bruun. *Text and History: Historiography and the Study of the Biblical*
- 569 *Text*. Diss. U Aarhus 2002. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- 570 Long, V. Philips. “How Reliable Are Biblical Reports? Repeating Lester Grabbe’s
- 571 Comparative Experiment.” *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002): 367–384.
- 572 ———. “Narrative and History: Stories about the Past.” Ed. Iain W. Provan, V. Phillips
- 573 Long, and Tremper Longman III. *A Biblical History of Israel*. Louisville: WJK,
- 574 2003. 75–97.
- 575 ———. *The Art of Biblical History*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994. Foundations
- 576 of Contemporary Interpretation 5.
- 577 Löwisch, Ingeborg. *Review of Jacqueline S. du Toit, Textual Memory: Ancient*
- 578 *Archives, Libraries and the Hebrew Bible*. Web. *Review of Biblical Literature*,
- 579 2013.
- 580 Mazar, Amihai. “The Spade and the Text: The Interaction between Archaeology and
- 581 Israelite History Relating to the Tenth–Ninth Centuries BCE.” *Understanding the*
- 582 *History of Ancient Israel*. Ed. by H. G. M. Williamson. New York: Oxford UP,
- 583 2007. 143–171. *Proc. of the British Academy* 143.
- 584 ———. See also under Finkelstein, Israel.
- 585 Millard, Alan R. “Story, History, and Theology.” *Faith, Tradition, and History: Old*
- 586 *Testament Historiography in Its Near Eastern Context*. Ed. Alan R. Millard, James
- 587 K. Hoffmeier, and David W. Baker. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994. 37–64.
- 588 Miller, J. Maxwell. See also under Hayes, John H.
- 589 Miller, Robert D. II. “Yahweh and His Clío: Critical Theory and Historical Criticism
- 590 of the Hebrew Bible.” *Currents in Biblical Research* 4 (2006): 149–168.
- 591 Moore, George Foote. “Tatian’s *Diatessaron* and the Analysis of the Pentateuch.”
- 592 *Journal of Biblical Literature* 9 (1890): 201–215.
- 593 Moore, Megan Bishop. *Beyond Minimalism. The Bible and Interpretation*. Mar. 2010.
- 594 Web. 24 May 2010.
- 595 ———. *Philosophy and Practice in Writing a History of Ancient Israel*. Diss. Emory
- 596 U, 2004. New York: Clark, 2006. *Lib. of Heb. Bible/Old Testament Studies* 435.
- 597 ———. “Writing Israel’s History Using the Prophetic Books.” *Israel’s Prophets and*
- 598 *Israel’s Past: Essays on the Relationship of Prophetic Texts and Israelite History*
- 599 *in Honor of John H. Hayes*. Ed. Brad E. Kelle and Megan Bishop Moore. New
- 600 York: Clark, 2006. 23–36. *Lib. of Heb. Bible/Old Testament Studies* 446.
- 601 Mykytiuk, Lawrence J. “Strengthening Biblical Historicity vis-à-vis Minimalism,
- 602 1992–2008, Part 1: Introducing a Bibliographic Essay in Five Parts.” *Journal*
- 603 *of Religious and Theological Information* 9.3–4 (2010): 71–83.
- 604 ———. “Strengthening Biblical Historicity vis-à-vis Minimalism, 1992–2008 and
- 605 Beyond, Part 2.1: The Literature of Perspective, Critique, and Methodology,
- 606 First Half.” *Journal of Religious and Theological Information* 11 (2012): 101–
- 607 137.
- 608 ———. “Strengthening Biblical Historicity vis-à-vis Minimalism, 1992–2008 and Be-
- 609 yond, Part 2.2: The Literature of Perspective, Critique, and Methodology, Sec-
- 610 ond Half.” *Journal of Religious and Theological Information* 12 (2013): 114–
- 611 155.

Q18

Q19

- 612 Na'aman, Nadav. "Does Archaeology Really Deserve the Status of a 'High Court'
613 in Biblical Historical Research?" *Between Evidence and Ideology: Essays on the*
614 *History of Ancient Israel read at the Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament*
615 *Study and the Oud Testamentisch Werkgezelschap, Lincoln, July 2009*. Ed. Bob
616 Becking and Lester L. Grabbe. Leiden: Brill, 2011. 165–183. *Oudtestamentische*
617 *Studien* 59.
- 618 Newman, John Henry. *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*. 8th ed. Ed. Ian T.
619 Ker. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985. 1889.
- 620 Nicholson, Ernest W. "Current 'Revisionism' and the Literature of the Old Testament."
621 In *Search of Pre-Exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*.
622 Ed. John Day. London: Clark, 2004. 1–22. *Journal for the Study of the Old*
623 *Testament Supp. Ser.* 406.
- 624 Norman, Andrew P. "Telling It Like It Was: Historical Narratives on Their Own
625 Terms." *The History and Narrative Reader*. Ed. Geoffrey Roberts. London and
626 New York: Routledge, 2001. 181–196.
- 627 Provan, Iain W. "Ideologies, Literary and Critical: Reflections on Recent Writing on
628 the History of Israel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114 (1995): 585–606.
- 629 ———. "In the Stable with the Dwarves: Testimony, Interpretation, Faith and the
630 History of Israel." 2000. *Windows into Old Testament History: Evidence, Argu-*
631 *ment, and the Crisis of "Biblical Israel"*. Ed. V. Philips, David W. Baker, and
632 Gordon J. Wenham. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002. 161–197.
- 633 Provan, Iain W., V. Phillips Long, and Tremper Longman III. *A Biblical History of*
634 *Israel*. Louisville: WJK, 2003.
- 635 Rollston, Christopher A. *Writing and Literacy in the World of Ancient Israel: Epi-*
636 *graphic Evidence from the Iron Age*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
637 *Archaeology and Biblical Studies* 11.
- 638 Smith, Mark S. "Preface to the Second Edition." *The Early History of God: Yahweh*
639 *and Other Deities in Ancient Israel*. 1990. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.
640 xii–xxxviii. *The Biblical Resources Series*.
- 641 ———. *The Memoirs of God: History, Memory, and the Experience of the Divine in*
642 *Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2004.
- 643 Sparks, Kenton L. *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the*
644 *Background Literature*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009. 2005.
- 645 Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the*
646 *Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana U P, 1985. *Indiana Studies in Bib. Lit.*
- 647 Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. Harmondsworth, Middle-
648 sex: Penguin Books, 1963.
- 649 Thompson, Thomas L. *The Early History of the Israelite People: From the Written*
650 *and Archaeological Sources*. New York: Brill, 1992. *Studies in the History of the*
651 *Ancient Near East* 4.
- 652 Toit, Jaqueline S. du. *Textual Memory: Ancient Archives, Libraries, and the Hebrew*
653 *Bible*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011. *Social World of Biblical*
654 *Antiquity* 2/6.
- 655 Vaughn, Andrew G. "Is Biblical Archaeology Theologically Useful Today? Yes, A
656 Programmatic Proposal." *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple*
657 *Period*. Ed. Andrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew. Atlanta: Society of Biblical
658 *Literature*, 2003. 407–430. *SBL Symposium Series* 18.

- 659 White, Hayden. "The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory."
 660 *History and Theory* 23 (1984): 1–33.
- 661 Williamson, H. G. M. "The Origins of Israel: Can We Safely Ignore the Bible?" *The*
 662 *Origin of Early Israel—Current Debate: Biblical, Historical and Archaeological*
 663 *Perspectives: Irene Levi-Sala Seminar, 1997*. Ed. Shmuel A(ituv and Eliezer D.
 664 Oren. Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, 1998. 141–161. Beer-
 665 Sheva Studies by the Department of Bible and Ancient Near East 12.
- 666 Zevit, Ziony. *Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallaxic Approaches*. Lon-
 667 don: Continuum, 2001.

668

APPENDIX

- 669 The Approach of David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible:*
 670 *A New Reconstruction*. 2011.

Q21

671 Amid the disparate variety of current approaches to study of the Hebrew
 672 Bible, Carr analyzed and built on an inescapable pair of elements that con-
 673 tributed to its formation.⁵⁹ He set these forth as a modest, stabilizing factor
 674 in which scholars can ground their studies. These elements are oral tradi-
 675 tion accompanying textual transmission by "scribes/priests/scholars" (Carr
 676 *Formation* 6; cf., Kofoed 59–60, 83, 88). More specifically, he described the
 677 "writing-supported process of memorization" (5). "As I argued in a prior
 678 book, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*,
 679 the texts of the Hebrew Bible, like those of many better-documented cultures
 680 surrounding it [viz., Egyptian, Greek, and Mesopotamian], were formed in
 681 an oral-written context where the masters of literary tradition used texts to
 682 memorize certain traditions seen as particularly ancient, holy, and divinely
 683 inspired" (Carr *Formation* 4). The documented ancient Near Eastern phe-
 684 nomenon of memory supported by written texts effectively puts an end to
 685 the 20th-century notion that oral transmission was chronologically succeeded
 686 by written transmission.

687 The process was oriented toward oral presentation of the written Torah
 688 "and adaptation of it for a community or sub-community" (5). Carr sought to
 689 ascertain "how, when, and why scribes in ancient Israel innovated in their
 690 written performance of the sacred tradition for their communities, and when
 691 and why they moved toward more strict conservation"—two impulses that
 692 were often at odds with each other (6–7).

693 Although it is impossible for a short summary on methodology to do
 694 justice to the numerous thoroughgoing, reflective portions of *Formation*,
 695 one can at least describe its three parts and give some indications of its
 696 importance and implications for biblical historicity. Part 1 of Mykytiuk doc-
 697 uments "the fact that ancient scribes significantly revised the texts that they
 698 transmitted and the reality that this process of revision—often by way of

699 memory—often was too fluid to reconstruct in detail” (7). In support of
 700 this proposition, a major strength of Carr’s work is its empirical grounding
 701 of scribal practices. He presents many textual examples, whether finely ana-
 702 lyzed or simply mentioned. These include differing versions of the Gilgamesh
 703 epic, the rewritten Bible of second-Temple times, and the ancient versions.
 704 He finds graphic variants (e.g., haplography), aural variants, and, most sig-
 705 nificantly, memory variants (e.g., use of synonymous words or phrases or
 706 similar biblical texts). He avoids the term *oral*, because memory variants are
 707 supported by relatively stable texts, whereas orality is much more fluid and
 708 cannot be traced in detail. Internal biblical revisions involve such processes
 709 as combining texts, expanding them, preserving only parts of them, and
 710 harmonizing them. Thus, vocabulary and style of writing are rendered unre-
 711 liable indicators of particular sources, and updates in terminology similarly
 712 make certain language indications unclear. The results are that (1) linguistic
 713 dating is rendered much less reliable and (2) sources, though traceable in
 714 some instances, are not as thoroughly traceable as scholars have assumed.
 715 It remains true that in cases where a fixed set of distinctive traits appear
 716 together in a particular portion of text, they can clearly indicate a particular
 717 source (109).⁶⁰ The overall result, however, is that our present-day ability
 718 to reconstruct transmission history is much more limited than previously
 719 thought.

720 Part 2 of Carr’s book gives a period-by-period, general description of
 721 scribal activity and the writing of books of the Hebrew Bible and, as relevant,
 722 apocryphal or deuterocanonical books. Reverse chronological order works
 723 advantageously, beginning with much documented data to provide a firm
 724 start, whereas less plentiful data from earlier periods require a more tenta-
 725 tive approach and greater qualification of results. The Hasmonean period
 726 involved “emergent standardization of the Hebrew Bible, both in scope and
 727 (textual) form” (153). Treating the books of Esther and Daniel as products of
 728 the Hellenistic era, Carr found the use of an earlier form of Hebrew to be an
 729 archaizing technique. He assigned the origin of books treating the restoration
 730 from exile, such as Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra, and Nehemiah, along with Isaiah
 731 chapters 56 through 59, to the Persian era. In these books, the good image
 732 of Persian rule stands in sharpest contrast with that of previous empires.
 733 This exceptional presentation makes it seem likely that it was perpetuated
 734 by scribes who favored Persian rule. Also, not attributing a more extensive
 735 list to this period is contrary to recent, minimalistic trends.

736 Observing that the Hebrew Bible is a “Bible for exiles” (226), Carr
 737 included among books of exilic-period origin the books of Lamentations
 738 and Ezekiel, as well as Deutero-Isaiah, prophetic oracles against Babylon,
 739 and priestly versus non-priestly versions of the Hexateuch. Such versions
 740 were harmonized in later periods. Works from the neo-Assyrian period in-
 741 clude contemporaneous prophetic oracles and other writings that reflect
 742 Assyrian literary genres and motifs. For example, after discussing affinities

743 between Joshua–2 Kings and Assyrian writings, Carr observed, “This back-
744 ground would suggest that the first edition(s) of the broader history of kings
745 in Samuel–Kings probably originated in the late pre-exilic period of Judah’s
746 history. . .” (312).

747 Considering Carr’s increasingly cautious approach to earlier and earlier
748 periods, it seems remarkable that part 3 of *Formation* dares to venture into
749 a tentative treatment of the early monarchic period. He considered it rea-
750 sonable for there to have been a tenth- to ninth-century formation of the
751 Israelite kingdom. It would have standardized the Phoenician script (lead-
752 ing to its distinctively Hebrew development “first attested only in the ninth
753 century”⁶¹), instituted scribal education,⁶² and produced a body of national
754 literature for the purposes of preserving and inculcating Israelite history and
755 culture.⁶³ To the early monarchic period, Carr cautiously assigned the com-
756 position of certain royal psalms, proverbs (with indications that some are
757 attributable to Solomon; 410), the Song of Songs (434), the Covenant Code,
758 and the primeval history minus the P version. Thus Carr’s view of the early
759 monarchy partly coincides with Williamson’s proposal that it was a prime
760 period for production of texts that enshrine the national heritage.